REMARKS

Applicant respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Markus et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601, hereafter referred to as Markus. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Markus.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to amended independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method for providing transaction processing in a palmtop computer, comprising:

providing a file server for processing wireless queries and for serving as an interface between said palmtop computer system and the Internet <u>wherein the palmtop computer utilizes Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary;</u>

providing a personal information database, residing on the file

server, containing personal information data relating to a user of the

palmtop computer;

providing a site map database, residing on the file server, the site

map database containing data which maps fields of the personal

information database to frames of known Web clippings;

receiving a <u>wireless</u> request from a palmtop computer to populate

frames of a selected Web clipping;

retrieving personal information data from the personal information

database for fields mapped to the frame in the selected Web clipping in

the site map database; and

transmitting <u>wirelessly</u> the retrieved personal information to the

palmtop computer.

Independent Claim 10 recites a similar limitation. Claims 2-8 that depend from

independent Claim 1, and Claims 11-14 that depend on independent Claim 10

provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Markus and the claimed invention are very different. Applicant

understands Markus to teach a server system for automatically inserting data into

electronic forms (Abstract). Markus teaches an end user computer that is a

stand-alone computer with access to the Internet and contains an Internet

browser program and a browser window (col. 7 lines 29-33). In addition, Markus

teaches the process of automatic form completion beginning with a user

downloading the form from a web site (Col. 7 lines 41-42). In contrast,

embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a method for

providing transaction processing in a palmtop computer that is not directly

connected to the Internet. Further, the claimed limitations of the present

invention access forms from a file server for processing <u>wireless</u> queries and for

<u>serving as an interface between a palmtop computer system and the Internet</u>

<u>wherein the palmtop computer utilizes Internet resources using said file server as</u>

<u>an intermediary</u>, as claimed.

The claimed limitations of the present invention specify a file server that

<u>interfaces</u> the palmtop computer with the Internet and provides the forms to the

end computer system without the end computer system downloading the forms

from the Internet. Markus actually <u>teaches away</u> from the claimed limitations of

the present invention by teaching an end user computer with an Internet

connection and Internet browser to download forms from the Internet. The

palmtop computer of the present invention may not comprise resources sufficient

to download forms from the Internet. Instead, the claimed limitations of the

present invention utilize a file server to interface the palmtop computer with the

Internet and to provide <u>web clippings</u> that can be automatically filled. The end

computer system is not directly connected to the Internet and does not download

forms from the Internet, as taught by Markus.

Applicant respectfully asserts that nowhere does Markus teach, disclose

or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and

that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant

respectfully submits that Markus also does not teach or suggest the additional

claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-8 which depend

from independent Claim 1 and Claims 11-14 which depend from independent

Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8 and 10-14

overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for

allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Markus in view of Rai U.S. Patent No. 6,421,714, hereafter

referred to as Rai. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully

submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 9 and 15-20 is not

anticipated nor rendered obvious by Markus in view of Rai.

As described above, Markus and the claimed invention are very different.

Markus actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present

invention by having the end computer system download forms directly from the

Internet. The present invention retrieves personal information data from the

personal information database for fields mapped to the frame in the selected

Web clipping in the site map database, as claimed. The present invention does

not download forms from the Internet, as taught by Markus. Rai may teach

wireless access to the public Internet (col. 2 line 36), but does not remedy the deficiencies in Markus.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Markus and Rai teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 10 or 16 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Markus taken in combination with Rai does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 9 which depends from independent Claim 1, Claim 15 which depends on independent Claim 10 and Claims 16-20 which depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 15-20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative

at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: _11/14_, 2003

Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060